

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 have been revised to better define the claimed invention. New claims 12-14 corresponding to claims 6, 8, and 9 have been added to provide Applicants with the scope of protection to which they are believed entitled. The amended/new claims find solid support in the original specification and drawings.<sup>1</sup> No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

Claims 6 and 8-11 are believed to remain allowed/allowable notwithstanding the above amendments which are mostly as to form and/or do not significantly alter the claim scopes.

The art rejections of claims 1-5 and 7 are noted. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's position because the applied reference of *Lipner* belongs to a remote art and fails to fairly teach or disclose many claim features, amendments have nevertheless been made to specifically avoid the rejections, solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution.

In particular, independent claims 1 and 2 have been amended to be in line with the corresponding language of allowed claims 10 and 11. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 2 now require an access rule extracting unit for extracting access rules set for routes to a plurality of device files corresponding to a common device; and an access rule deriving unit for deriving a unified access rule for each device on the basis of the extracted access rules. The above features are deemed neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by the applied reference.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1-2 as amended are patentable over the applied art of record. Dependent claims 3-5, 7 and new claims 12-14 should also be considered patentable at least for the same reason.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, difference rule deriving unit 320 in FIG. 8 and the corresponding text in page 20, lines 3-6 and page 24, lines 1-4.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, the Examiner's analysis found in page 2 of the Office Action regarding claims 1-5 where no "rule extracting/deriving" units are discussed as being found in or suggested by *Lipner*.

All claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP**

Benjamin J. Hauptman  
Registration No. 29,310

**HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY**

Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400  
Telephone: 703-684-1111  
Facsimile: 970-898-0640  
**Date: August 20, 2007**  
BJH:KL/tal